

Concordia  
University  
Students'  
Association inc

Association des  
Etudiants et Etudiantes  
de l'Université  
Concordia inc



1441 Sherbrooke St. W. Montreal H4B 1R6

(514) 848-7440

1455 De Maisonneuve Blvd. W. Montreal H3G 1M8 (514) 848-7474

## CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' ASSOCIATION

### ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTIETH MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

HELD ON TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 1991 AT 6:00 P.M.  
IN H-662, SIR GEORGE WILLIAMS CAMPUS

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Interim Chairperson, Scott White, called this informal meeting to order at 6:25 P.M.

#### 2. ROLL CALL

##### PRESENT

##### CO-PRESIDENTS

Sammy Powell (8:20 p.m.)

##### ARTS AND SCIENCE

Caroline Audet

Eleanor Brown (8:11 p.m.)

Anne-Marie Clarke

Jennifer Dang-Tran

Ariel Deluy

Sophie Desjardins

Hernani Farias

Charlene Nero

David Schwalb

Esther Vise

Tues day, March 5, 6:00 P.M.

**COMMERCE**

Thomas Dowd  
Jennifer Kalman

**ENGINEERING**

Jarno Makkonen

**FINE ARTS**

George Liem

**ABSENT**

**Arts and Science:** Sandra Branker (w/r), Melodie Sullivan, Nadine Wilson

**Commerce:** Robin Chabot (w/r), Karen Cox (w/r), Micheal Drolet,  
Esmeralda Florio, Christopher Halsted, Katherine Kruse

**Engineering:** John Kelly (w/r), Duen Lup Tsui (w/r)

**Fine Arts:** Cathy Balsitis, Kellie Coppin (w/r)

**3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**MOTION**

**Be It Resolved That the Agenda of the 120th meeting of the Board of Directors be approved.**

Moved by: D. Schwalb

Seconded by : E. Vise

**Discussion:**

D. Schwalb requested that since the Co-Presidents are not present nor any of the executives that items 5.1, 5.2 and 6.0 be deleted from the agenda and that in its place items 7.13, 7.14 and 7.15 be inserted. This amendment was seconded by H. Farias.

T. Dowd objected to this amendment, since the Board passed a motion on March 1st, whereby item 7.8 would be given precedence over all other motions. T. Dowd asked the Chair to rule on this issue. The Chair said that if this was decided at the last meeting as first item of priority, then it should be the first item on the agenda.

**MOTION TO AMEND AGENDA**

Moved by: D. Schwalb

Seconded by: C. Nero

VOTE ON MOTION TO AMEND AGENDA

9 / 4 / 0

CARRIED

**5.1 CO-PRESIDENTIAL DECISION CONSIDERED NULL AND VOID**

Whereas the CUSA Constitution does permit the Co-President(s) to make decisions between the Board of Directors meetings subject to Article 6.1.1, 6.1.2, 6.1.3 AND

Whereas the Co-President, Tammy Powell, decided to veto a motion by the Board of Directors on November 16, 1990, titled Item 4.0-Special Agenda Item, that being: the "removal of Mr. S. Letovsky from the office of the Co-President of CUSA" AND

Whereas the Co-President, Tammy Powell contravened Article 6.1.1 g) AND

Whereas this Action clearly constitutes a 'delinquency of duties', as defined in Article 18.1 and is a flagrant violation of the CUSA Constitution,

Be It Resolved That the aforementioned decision made by the Co-President, Tammy Powell, be considered null and void-in Accordance with Article 6.1.1g)

Be It Further Resolved That the Board views with great concern the actions taken by the Co-President, Tammy Powell.

Moved by: D. Schwalb

Seconded by: C. Nero

C. Nero asked if the intent of this motion is to reinstate or re-impeach S. Letovsky. D. Schwalb replied that it is to re-assert the impeachment of S. Letovsky.

H. Farias said that the problem lies in the fact that T. Powell gave specific orders to the administrative staff to continue recognizing S. Letovsky as Co-President, and that this is where the problem lies. He also said that the intent of this motion is to inform the administrative staff not to recognize S. Letovsky as Co-President.

C. Nexo suggested that perhaps there should be a further resolution suspending from T. Powell the ability of reinstating S. Letovsky so that the same thing does not occur again. D. Schwalb said that the Co-Presidents can veto any motion of the Board and that by putting a clause here, it would not necessarily prohibit T. Powell from vetoing the motions put forth by the Board.

**VOTE ON MOTION**

**1 0 / 0 / 3**

**CARRIED**

### **5.2 Vacancy In a Co-Presidential Position**

Whereas there exists a vacancy on the Board of Directors, in the position of a Co-President,

Be It Resolved That the Board appoint \_\_\_\_\_ as replacement AND

Be It Further Resolved That the said replacement be entrusted with the full powers of Co-Presidency, including, but not limited to signing authority on all cheques issued by the Concordia University Students' Association.

Moved by: D. Schwalb

Seconded by: H. Farias

J. Makkonen pointed out that the Board needs 2/3 of the sitting directors and for this reason the motion as it stands would not pass.

It was unanimously agreed that this motion be tabled for the next meeting.

### **5.3 Conflict Within the Code of Conduct**

Be It Resolved That the CUSA Board of Directors voice its concern and wishes that the University Administration resolve the issue which has come to our attention within the office of the Code of Conduct non-academic. We urge the University, on behalf of the student body, to act as quickly and effectively as possible in order to restore faith in the office of the Code of Conduct non-academic.

Moved by: D. Schwalb

Seconded by: H. Farias

C. Nero asked to know what the directors "directors voicing its concern" in realistic terms implies and what does the resolution intend to do. D. Schwalb replied that directors are invited to write a letter to the administrators but due process has to take place right now. He also said that the issue is going to be dealt with within the mechanisms that are provided in the Code of Conduct itself. D. Schwalb said that by passing a motion, voicing the concerns of the students, the Board would send a strong signal to the administration that we are concerned.

T. Dowd said that the motion entails a case being brought forth to the Code of Conduct non-academic and that a certain point, John Relton, wrote a letter to the Thursday Report which blasted a student and revealed his impartiality.

E. Vise suggested that the Board name the individuals that were involved. D. Schwalb replied that those who are involved know who they are.

H. Farias asked to know if the letter that was written to the mass media was done before the judgement was rendered or after. T. Dowd replied that it was done after the decision was rendered.

C. Nero suggested that an insertion be made right before "We urge the University" and that it be done in parenthesis, mainly: (namely in the case of David Parent versus Brenda Panunto and David Parent versus John Relton, the Code of Conduct). There were no objections to this amendment.

**VOTE ON MOTION**

**UNANIMOUS**

#### **5.4 No Executives Paid Until After Ratification**

**Be It Resolved That No Executives of the 1991-92 Term Gets Paid Until Ratification By the Board of Directors Takes Place.**

Moved by: H. Farias

Seconded by: A. Deluy

H. Farias said that the intent of this motion is to prevent the mistakes made this year. He also said that this motion will in effect force the Board of Directors either to ratify individuals or to fill the positions quickly and efficiently. He also said that if individuals are not ratified they will not stick around to do the job and that this motion in effect puts pressure on the Board of Directors to fill the vacancies.

**Tues day, March 5, 6:00 P.M.**

C. Nero said that she does not foresee the same problems next year and executives that are working hard should be rewarded for their services. She also said that the problem might lie in the Board's incompetence and consequently the executives being unduly penalized.

H. Farias proposed adding the following amendment:

Be It Further Resolved That the executives can be paid interimally upon the ratification of the position by the Executive Board.

#### **MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION**

Moved by: T. Dowd

Seconded by: J. Makkonen

**VOTE ON MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION**

**UNANIMOUS**

**VOTE ON MOTION**

**5 / 5 / 3**

**DEFEATED**

#### **5.5 Proposal For Change In the Structure of student Associations at Concordia**

Refer to (BD-D1) for accompanying motion.

Moved by: T. Dowd

Seconded by: J. Kalman

T. Dowd said that since this package is rather lengthy, it would be advisable to split up the questions and vote on them individually.

T. Dowd pointed out that this motion is a step towards the rationalization of the structure and that it creates faculty associations. He also said that coming from a faculty association himself, they do work and are viable organizations which represent specific interests.

D. Schwalb said that it is a good attempt, but it does not incorporate what CUSA would be after that, and that J. Makkonen's amended proposals have to be incorporated into this.